

# Radical Abolitionist.

"PROCLAIM LIBERTY THROUGHOUT ALL THE LAND, UNTO ALL THE INHABITANTS THEREOF."—LEV. xxv. 10.

VOLUME II.]

NEW YORK, AUGUST, 1856.

[NUMBER 1.

## The Radical Abolitionist.

WILLIAM GOODELL, Editor.

Is Published Monthly,

AT 48 BEEKMAN STREET, NEW YORK.

BY THE AMERICAN ABOLITION SOCIETY.

### TERMS.

PER ANNUM, OR FOR TWELVE NUMBERS.

SINGLE COPIES.....	\$0.50
FIVE COPIES directed to one person.....	2.00
EIGHT COPIES, do. do. ....	3.00
FOURTEEN COPIES, do. do. ....	5.00
THIRTY COPIES, do. do. ....	10.00

Payments in advance.

All letters must be post-paid.

Small change, or sums less than one dollar, may be sent in post-office stamps; or, if stamps cannot be procured, one dollar may be sent, and the balance will be sent back in stamps deducting postage.

### PROSPECTUS.

The "RADICAL ABOLITIONIST" proposes a proclamation of "liberty throughout all the land, unto all the inhabitants thereof." It demands of the *American Government* and the *American People*, the immediate and unconditional abolition of *American Slavery*.

It makes this demand on behalf of three millions of Americans already enslaved, on behalf of twenty millions more in process of becoming enslaved, and in behalf of the untold millions of their posterity, who must be enslaved for ages to come, unless *American Slavery* be overthrown.

It urges this demand in the name of humanity chattelized, republicanism disgraced, religion dishonored, the Holy Scriptures perverted, the Saviour blasphemed, the laws of nature and of nature's God trampled under foot.

It denies that the *Federal Government*, under the *Federal Constitution*, has either a moral or a political right to tolerate slavery, in any of the States belonging to the *Federal Union*, for a single day.

"The United States SHALL guarantee to EVERY State in the Union a republican form of government."—*Constitution*.

"The foundation of republican government is the right of every citizen, in his person and property, and in their management."—*Jefferson*.

It denies that "the reserved rights of the States" include any such right as that of holding property in man, as no such "right" can exist; and Mr. Madison tells us that the *Federal Convention* would not permit the *Constitution* to recognize any such right.—*Vide Madison Papers*.

It affirms that the *Constitution* unequivocally inhibits the States from maintaining slavery.

"No State shall pass any bill of attainder, or laws impairing the obligation of contracts." And "No person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law."—*Constitution*.

It affirms that the *Constitution* was formed by "the people of the United States," (all of them,) "to secure the blessings of LIBERTY for (themselves) and (their) posterity," without exception or distinction of race or color. And hence, no portion of "the people of the United States" can be constitutionally enslaved, and the declared object of the *Constitution* requires the *Federal Government* to "secure the blessings of liberty" to each and all of them.

If the *Constitution* is not available for these purposes, it is of no practical value, it is condemned by its own high professions, and the people have no alternative left them but to provide a better government for their protection, or become the serfs of the petty oligarchy of three hundred thousand slaveholders, who are now suffered to control and insult a great nation.

The "RADICAL ABOLITIONIST" recognizes as valid law no unrighteous enactments. It affirms, with all the great writers on Common Law, "that statutes against fundamental morality are void;" that "no human laws have any validity if contrary to the law of God, and such of them as are valid derive all their force, mediately, or immediately, from this original."—FORTESCUE.

On this ground, as well as from the admitted absence of any positive law in this country, establishing slavery; from the known incompetency of the colonial legislatures under British common law, to legalize it; from the ascertained illegality of the African slave trade, by which the colonies were supplied with slaves; and from the unanimous declaration of the thirteen original States, in the very act of establishing their independent governments, that all just governments are founded on the "inalienable right" of "all men" to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," we affirm the absolute illegality of American slavery. We deny that it has any more legality in Georgia than in Massachusetts; that it is any more legal than the African slave-trade, or any other form of piracy and crime.

The object of this paper will be to unfold, explain, vindicate, and propagate these sentiments, calling on the people to maintain them at the ballot-box, thus providing for a federal legislature, a federal judiciary and a federal executive, that shall give them a national expression and force.

### REPUBLICAN GRAND RATIFICATION MEETING IN NEW YORK.

From the *N. Y. Tribune* and *N. Y. Times* we extract a few particulars of the "Republican Grand Ratification" meeting in Broadway Tabernacle, June 25. On this, as on other recent "Republican" demonstrations, we cannot but observe the absence, from the programme and reports, of the names most prominent at the meetings of the late "Free Soil" and "Free Democracy" movements, two or three years ago.

The names of John Jay, Minthorne Tompkins, and others of the old guard of "non-extension" would seem to have disappeared from the platform. Gov. Seward, Preston King, and B. F. Butler send in formal letters of adhesion, as is common for antiquated politicians to do after the control of political affairs has fallen into new hands. Now that the old motto of "No more slave States" has disappeared from the banner, and nothing is said against the Fugitive Slave Bill, it is befitting that the old champions of that flag should be kept in the back-ground.

In order to produce the required scenic effect, it is important to arrange, judiciously, the fore-ground and back-ground personages of the drama. New names, less obnoxious to pro-slavery prejudices, are, accordingly, brought forward. Judge Emmett, Hon. Wm. A. Howard, Senator Trumbull of Ohio, Attorney-General Kimball of Ohio, &c. were the principal speakers on this occasion.

Judge Emmett temporarily presided, and made a speech. As reported in the *New York Tribune*, he said:

"Fellow-citizens, the rush that was made for the name Fremont, when his name was first whispered, was inexplicable. It is still, in a measure, a mystery

to me, because I am unable to fathom the causes which should induce such men as were in that Convention to take up, apparently without consideration, a man who has no political antecedents whatever—as John C. Fremont may be said not to have any. But it was because he had no political antecedents—[Applause]—because he was the representative of Young America." [Tremendous cheers.]

Every body knows that the phrase "Young America" is the favorite cognomen and watch-word of the fillibusters, and that Stephen A. Douglass rose to popularity on the strength of it. The "Republicans"—it seems—are determined to out-bid Buchanan on this plank of his own platform; as the "young Americans" will prefer the vigorous and adventurous hero of fillibustering enterprise to the superannuated old Secretary who only had the merit of giving it his official direction and sanction.

And thus the "mystery" of Fremont's sudden popularity is explained. Nobody among abolitionists and earnest anti-slavery men and free-soilers ever dreamed of it. It was concocted among the wire-pullers who were determined on office, at all hazards. The feelers were put out—the trap sprung, and even Judge Emmett was taken by surprise, and could hardly account for the "mystery"! Fremont was taken up by the Convention, "without consideration"! Precious confession! Or, was it designed as a reproof? The country has had too much experience, already, of the mischiefs of nominating Presidents by acclamation, and "hurra"—"without consideration"!

Then, again, Col. Fremont was nominated, "because he had no political antecedents"! This is the well-known expedient of political jugglers who wish to conceal their real designs from the people. But why should honest and patriotic men follow the bad example? It would be no disparagement to Col. Fremont to say that he is unskilled in the arts of political demagogues, but we should charitably hope that it would hardly be proper or just to intimate that Fremont should displace all the old "free-soil" and "free-democracy" leaders on such grounds. The lack of statesmanship should, at all times, be regarded as an utter disqualification for the Presidency, and the more especially, in times like these, which require the most profound statesmanship that the country affords. But Col. Fremont is selected for the absence of this! He "has no political antecedents whatever"—no political character. He must be taken only on his professions. And they are the professions of a man who has had no political experience—no political history—no political study—no means of acquiring that rare fund of knowledge, which the chief magistrate of a great republic, in times of imminent danger and perplexing difficulty should possess. From nominations of this character, what can we expect

but one of these two things—either a self willed ignoramus, in the Presidential chair, too reckless to take advice from any body, or an imbecile ignoramus, controlled by whoever may happen to stand next to him. A President, in times like these, without political antecedents, experience, and character, will be either one or the other of these, of course. We have had enough of such Presidents, already.

But we must proceed. Judge Emmett went on to say that

"Any attempt to say one word against the nomination would have been useless. Any one who had uttered one word against him, might as well have attempted to stop the torrent of Niagara with a pitch fork." [Laughter.]

A very graphic description, certainly, of one of those periods of popular frenzy and delusion in which it is of little use to attempt reasoning with people. The world's history is full of illustrations of the dangers to constitutional freedom, from the elevation of popular favorites, under influences and excitements of this sort. But when was it ever known that the reign of protecting law was secured by them? The very best that can be said of them is, that they sometimes result only in the disappointment of those who have most confidently confided in them.

Judge Emmett could not forbear discussing still further the qualifications of the unexpected candidate. His statement confirms what we had previously said of him.

"Since I returned to New York, a gentleman not without his importance in society, has expressed to me his curiosity to know what John C. Fremont has ever done. I did not undertake to tell him, nor shall I tell you. I will tell you something he *has not done*. [Voice, 'Good, good.'] He has had no hand in the repeal of the Missouri Compromise [Applause]. He has had no hand in the passage of the Kansas-Nebraska Bill [Applause]. I think that's enough. [Voice, 'Has he had anything to do with the Ostend Manifesto?'] No; I thank my friend for the suggestion. I will tell you what he has done. He conquered California with 62 men. [Prolonged cheering.] He is the path-finder through the Rocky Mountains. [Cheers.]

The Judge said nothing of Col. Fremont's advocacy of the claims of the enslaved, nor even of his devotion to the principles of "non-extension" and the motto of "No more slave States." But he did not forget to commend him as a man who—unlike his competitor, had had "the courage to marry a wife"! And he dwelt much on the presumptive evidence of his merit, that he had "won the heart and the hand of Thomas H. Benton's daughter." [Great laughter and three cheers for Mrs. Fremont.] "I tell you," continued Mr. Emmett, "that it is no small feather in his cap, and that it is, *by no means, a small item in the qualifications he possesses of being President of the United States.*" [Cheers and laughter.]

Only think of it! A Presidential candidate, for the "Republican party," one of whose chief qualifications for the Presidency is, that he is the son-in-law of a large slaveholder! What further evidence is needed that he belongs to the governing caste? What are the qualifications of Gerrit Smith, or of Seward, Sumner, Hale, Wade, Chase, or Giddings, in the comparison with Fremont? The opponents of the "oligarchy" ought to be everlastingly under

obligations for the condescension of so exalted a character, in becoming their candidate—an arrangement very nearly as much unexpected, perhaps, to him as to them. What a convenience to have political brokers, who know how to hunt up candidates for constituencies, and constituencies for candidates who would, otherwise, never have known of each other.

Seriously, one is tempted to think that the ratification meeting at the Tabernacle was a broad farce, got up for amusement, a satire, a joke. And yet it would hardly do to say that the President, Vice-Presidents, Secretaries, and dignitaries of the meeting, were assembled for that purpose.

The candidate for the Vice-Presidency fared little better at the hands of Judge Emmett than Col. Fremont.

Judge Emmett resumed—"Now, fellow-citizens, let me say that we closed our labors at Philadelphia by putting in nomination Mr. Dayton, of New Jersey, for Vice-President. [Applause.] Mr. Dayton was comparatively unknown to the Convention. Nobody mentioned his name till Sumner and Banks had been withdrawn. But the moment his name was mentioned, it ran through the Convention like wildfire. It is needless for me to detain you longer. You know what we have done as well as I can tell you. You know our principles—you have read our platform. Do you approve of it?" (Loud shouts of Yes! Yes!)

And so, having without "consideration" nominated for President a man whose nomination was "a mystery," they proceeded to nominate for Vice-President, a man "comparatively unknown to the Convention."

Passing strange was it, that, after this, Judge Emmett should have thought it necessary to disclaim abolitionism.

"Our opponents say we are sectional, that we are abolitionists, that we seek to create disunion and dissension. We know that this is not true. We know that we are not seeking to create dissensions. We know that we are conservatives. We know that we are the best friends of the South at this moment. (Cries of 'That's it!') Gentlemen, it is charged that abolitionism is a crime. It is a word of reproach which is used in this country against any man who is supposed to be at all affected by a feeling of opposition to slavery. It does no man any harm to examine himself on this subject of the abolition of slavery. (Applause.) It is one of those things in which, if we are too careful not to inoculate ourselves, it will, as a distinguished delegate remarked at the Convention in Philadelphia, break out all over in the natural way (laughter); and it is one of those things which we should never be afraid to look in the face, or to express our opinion upon. (Applause.) I am not in favor of meddling with the institutions of the South where they now exist, where they are protected by the laws of the State, and where they form a portion of the social customs; (cries of 'That's the talk,') but I think that the time will come when slavery will cease to exist in this country; and I fervently and sincerely hope that that time is not far distant." [Cries of 'So do we!']

One of the resolutions affirms "that the principle which lies at the foundation of the pro-slavery interest is, and must, of necessity, be aggressive." But the resolution failed to meet the issue, by proposing aggressive measures against slavery.

Senator Trumbull said—

"When you go into a Territory, you go to submit to the municipal laws there in force. If there was a law in force establishing slavery, of course you could take a slave there, and hold him. But if there was no

law on the subject of slavery, why, is it not a matter of course that the slave is free the moment he passes the boundary? (Applause.) It must be so, unless slavery is the normal condition of man." (Laughter and cheers.)

This was the wind-up of an attempted refutation of Senator Douglass' doctrine of "State equality," and of the consequent right of slave-holders to carry slavery into the territories. It will be seen that the attempted refutation concedes the right of property in man, where it is sanctioned by "municipal laws." And so it fails of reaching the point. A little further on, Mr. Trumbull said—

"It is not so much in reference to the welfare of the negro that we are here, but it is for the protection of the rights of the laboring whites, (cheers) for the protection of ourselves and our liberties. And I protest against this slavery propagandism, which, if it can take slavery into the Territories, will then take it into all the States of the Union."

And does Mr. Trumbull, and do those who cheered him, suppose that they can "protect the rights of the free laboring whites," without caring for the welfare of the negro? Does the God of nature and of Providence care more for the whites than for the blacks? How do they suppose the "rights of the free laboring whites" can be protected, in the presence of slavery? He proceeded:

"What next? Why, they say we are abolitionists. Well, that is just as false as their assertion that they are the friends of the Constitution, and the true Democracy—just as false! When you look over the platform of the party which has just nominated Col. Fremont (loud cheers), you will find no such thing there. They emphatically pronounce against disunion. They declare that the union of these States must and shall be preserved. Oh! but I've heard it said, why, you Republicans would repeal the Fugitive Slave law! You would abolish slavery in the District of Columbia! You would incite the slaves to insurrection, and set them to murder their masters. All this is in the imagination of the South—or it is not in their imagination, it is their invention. They know it is untrue. It is not found in the doctrines of the Philadelphia Convention."

And so he distinctly disclaimed, on behalf of the Philadelphia Convention, all design to abolish slavery in the Federal District, or to repeal the Fugitive Slave bill. A little further onward, he added—

"He did not wish to wrong the South—he did not object to the Fugitive Slave law. He thought the South was entitled to it. (Shouts of 'No, no; hisses, cries of 'Chair, chair; 'Question, question.') But he would not take his oath to assist when called upon to catch a runaway negro." (Loud cheers.)

The public sentiment of the community at large condemns the Fugitive Slave bill. But here was an attempt—though an unsuccessful one—by an Hon. U. S. Senator, in a "Republican" ratification meeting, to over-ride, or lower down this instinctive sense of humanity, justice and mercy.

A letter from Hon. Wm. H. Seward was read, endorsing the candidates and the platform. He said—

"Every step of the Republican party, since its inauguration, keeps time, most truly, with the accordant music of liberty and the Union."

"I subscribe, cheerfully, to the basis of the Convention, without wishing to add or subtract a principle or sentiment."

A similar letter from Hon. Charles Sumner,

we regret to say, has appeared in the papers. We had hoped that some, at least, of the Free Soil statesmen would come up to higher ground, instead of sinking lower. This is one of the bitter fruits of the "Republican" movement, already beginning to be witnessed.

#### REPUBLICAN MEETING IN BROOKLYN.

A Republican Ratification meeting was held in Brooklyn, June 27, called to order by Abijah Mann, and presided over by A. J. Berry, ex-Mayor.

"Resolved, That it is the unalterable purpose of the Republican party to preserve and defend the Constitution alike against avowed enemies and treacherous friends; with unshaken loyalty to stand to the last by the Union of these States—to prevent the enslavement of territory now free—to expose and resist all schemes to appropriate the blood and treasure of the people to the acquisition of new Slave Territory with the purpose of forming it, with the Southern States of this Union, into a separate Republic; and that we will hold the States of this Republic to their allegiance, duties and responsibilities under the Federal Constitution, by persuasion if possible—if necessary by force."

This does not look much like a dread of "consolidation"—nor like a permission of dissolution, either by slaveholders or by abolitionists. Carried out by "Radical Abolitionists," it would abolish slavery by Federal power. In the hands of a President not committed (as Col. Fremont is not) against the Fugitive Slave bill, it might be quoted as a prediction and promise to enforce the rendition of slaves. Which shall it be? No Federal Administration ever yet held, practically, to a low estimate of Federal powers. We are to have a Federal Government establishing or else abolishing slavery.—No mistake about that.

One of the speakers, Judge Kimball, said:

"*Slavery must stop where it is.* (Three cheers for Fremont.) The whole North must come together, now, and there must be no more dissension in the country."

Nothing in the reported proceedings looked towards the abolition of slavery.—But "there must be no more dissension in the country."—The liberties of three millions of colored people are not to be taken into consideration.

#### "FREMONT" REPUBLICANISM, AS EXPOUNDED BY HORACE GREELEY.

So far as can be ascertained, the shaping of the Republican Platform and the nomination of Col. Fremont, taken together, are more the work of Horace Greeley than of any other man living. The platform stands precisely in accordance with the Tribune's recommendation two years ago, though the National Era, and the Free Soil press, generally, had dissented. And it was from the Tribune that the people first learned (what few if any of them had ever before dreamed of,) that the first choice of the people was for Fremont. This discovery, the Free Soil presses were all slow to recognize. The unparalleled circulation of the Tribune, and the popularity of the Editor, enabled him to get the announcement *believed*, and this was a great step towards transforming the belief of it into a *fact*. Wherever the maxim

of "availability" is recognized, no additional question needed to be raised.

Well then. Let us look at an exposition of this platform, and of the criterion by which the candidate was selected, according to the testimony of the master workman that fashioned them both—Horace Greeley himself.

A correspondent of the Tribune (Mr. Daniel F. Miller of Iowa) informs Mr. Greeley that a report has been circulated in that region, that Col. Fremont is a slaveholder, "the owner of some twenty-three negro slaves." Mr. Miller desires Mr. Greeley to "inquire of Col. Fremont on the subject." Mr. Greeley does so, and in a letter to Mr. Miller, over his own signature,\* says—"The report is false—an inexcusable, unmitigated lie; we have authority for so pronouncing it."

So far, all very good. Why not leave the matter here? Why must Mr. Greeley go out of his way to add the following—

"Col. Fremont is not a slaveholder; but suppose he were—what of it? Do not you and I recognize the legal right to hold slaves in slave States? Have we not repeatedly voted for slaveholders whom we knew to be right on the great issues at stake? Is it not quite likely that we may do so again?"

And so, it would have been no objection to Col. Fremont, as the candidate of the Republican party, if he had been a slaveholder! And in order to conciliate the slaveholders, and propitiate their favor towards the Republican party, it becomes necessary to insult the abolitionists, and outrage the anti-slavery sentiment of the North (what there is of it) by declaring it to be a matter of no consequence whether the President of the United States be a slaveholder or no! This strikes us as a pretty bold stroke, at this stage of the campaign. The abolitionists and anti-slavery men, it seems, can be spared, rather than hazard the loss of the slaveholders whose conciliation is desired. The following additional extract shows that we have not misinterpreted Mr. Greeley, nor misapprehended his policy.

"Do you forget that Theodore G. Hunt, William Collum, Emerson Etheridge, and several more of the most determined opposers in the last Congress of the Nebraska Iniquity, were slaveholders? Do you not see that when you indignantly deny that Col. F. is a slaveholder, an adversary will argue that you tacitly affirm that all slaveholders ought to be proscribed and excluded from office? And, since you do not mean that, why give a caviller chance to infer it?"

"The legal right to hold slaves in the slave States" is here distinctly recognized by Mr. Greeley. And he understands that this is the position of his party. How does this agree with Mr. Greeley's endorsement of Gen. Granger's Speech in Congress, in which, (as Mr. Greeley says,) "he maintained that the Constitution, in several of its fundamental provisions, secures liberty to every innocent human being, and so forbids the enslavement of any?" He added—

"And that, a generation hence, when public sentiment shall have been enlightened and purified, may very probably, be the general interpretation." . . . "There must always be law enough, in a republic, to sweep away slavery, when the Judges can afford to discern and apply it."

\* See New York Daily Tribune, July 9.

But the *politicians*, it seems, as well as the Judges, cannot, at present, afford to be truthful! The 'public sentiment is not yet sufficiently enlightened and purified.' And hence Mr. Greeley writes to Mr. Miller—"Do not you and I recognize the legal right to hold slaves, in the slave States?"

This is what the old writers were wont to call "holding the truth in unrighteousness"—in modern phrase, 'holding to the truth in the abstract, but, as practical men, declining to make it a rule of action, because they cannot afford it'!

#### THE GARRISONIANS AND THE FREMONTERS.

We noticed, in our June number, the "singular commendation," by the National Anti-Slavery Standard, of the Republican party, as being, "on the whole, an advance on the parties of an anti-slavery complexion that went before it." We noticed that of those previous parties, one, the Liberty Party, went, in the first place, for the abolition of slavery in the Federal District and Territories, and inter-State slave trade, and afterwards, for abolition in the States;—another, the "Free Soil party," went for no more slave States nor slave Territory;—another, "the Free Democracy," added to this, the protection of colored seamen, and the repeal of the Fugitive Slave Bill. Last came the "Republican party," demanding only the freedom of Kansas, the exclusion of slavery from Territories once consecrated to freedom, and promising to resist, by lawful means, the existence of slavery in the Territories. And this, the Standard regarded "an advance."

Well. The "Republican party" has had another Convention, at Philadelphia, and has published another version of its platform, but making no new issue with the slave power.—And, therefore, the Standard of June 28 says of it—

"It fails, of course, to make what we must deem the only vital issue with the slave power, *but is, on the whole, less objectionable than we expected it would be.*"

Indeed! How "objectionable" did the Standard expect the Republican platform would be, at the time when commanding it for being "an advance"? What less could it be, and present any issue at all with the slave power? And how, in that case, could the Standard commend it for being "an advance" on the former parties, which certainly presented *some* issue?

"The only vital issue with the slave power," the Standard, we know, thinks to be disunion. We hardly see how this can be called an issue. The slave power likewise clamors for disunion.

A Philadelphia correspondent of the Standard, "M," who is evidently a Garrisonian disunionist, gives a somewhat favorable account of the Convention. No Liberty party Convention ever received so flattering a notice from that quarter. The Convention, he says, "was an anti-slavery Convention, that is, as far as it is possible for such a body to be anti-slavery—and its most influential men were anti-slavery men." Even Col. Webb comes in for a share of his commendation. Again, he says—

"The Convention was made up, as all such bodies are, of two classes—the conservative and the progres-

sive. The latter was largely in the majority, and their choice was Col. Fremont."

Marvellous! The writer himself adds—

"What it was and is in Mr. Fremont that commands such enthusiastic support, I have not heard exactly stated; but it seems to be a combination of qualities, the principal of which is a generous liberality of sentiment on the subject of slavery and a high-toned personal courage. The records of the Senate, during the short time he was a member of that body, show nothing in his favor as an anti-slavery man, nor is there anything in any of his public acts that can be referred to as entitling him to confidence on that question. . . . It is the prestige, doubtless, given him by his *heroic feats as an explorer and pioneer*, that inspires this enthusiasm. In the history of his daring adventures in the mountain passes with wild men and wild beasts, the people think they have assurance of a man with the capacity and nerve for a Presidential leader in the coming crisis. It seems to be the *instinct* of the people rather than any logical deduction on their part, that leads them to the selection of Col. Fremont as their standard-bearer, and instinct you know is a great matter. . . . Altogether, the Convention was an exceedingly interesting one, and, as you will have gathered from the tone of my letter, I was greatly pleased with it. I never was at a gathering of the kind before where I saw so much to approve and so little to condemn. It evinced a state of feeling on the part of the Northern States truly hopeful."

And so, Col. FREMONT, the Polk and Buchanan "explorer," alias fillibuster, "whose course in the Senate shows nothing in his favor as an anti-slavery man," commands a sympathy from Garrisonians that could never be extended to a Birney or a Gerrit Smith. The lowest tone of political anti-slavery is always most acceptable to them. Why is this? Why this marked preference for the party that proposes to do nothing for the slave—nothing for the colored man?

#### THE WAY TO PEACE—WHAT IS IT?

In the New York Independent of June 26th, Henry Ward Beecher says—

"The only way to peace is that way which shall chain slavery to the place that it now has, and say to the Dragon, 'In thine own den thou mayest dwell, and lie down in thine own slime. But thou shalt not go forth to ravage free territory, nor leave thy trail upon unspotted soil.'"

This declaration comes in the solemn style of the ancient prophets, but it strikes us that the sentiment is not exactly coincident. Let us see. What saith the Scriptures?

"Proclaim liberty throughout all the land, unto all the inhabitants thereof." Lev. xxv. 10.

"Execute judgment in the morning, and deliver him that is spoiled out of the hand of the oppressor, lest my fury go out like fire, and burn that none can quench it, because of the evil of your doings." Jer. xxi. 12.

"Therefore thus saith the Lord, Ye have not hearkened unto me, in proclaiming liberty, every one to his brother, and every man to his neighbor; behold, I proclaim a liberty for you, saith the Lord, to the sword, to the pestilence, and to the famine, and I will make you to be removed into all the kingdoms of the earth." Jer. xxxiv. 17.

This does not look much like finding "the way to peace" by proclaiming liberty to the Dragon to "dwell in his own den and lie down in his own slime," provided he will "not go

forth to ravage free territory, nor leave his trail upon unspotted soil."

And why should it? What consolation could such a proclamation afford to our three millions of slaves? What encouragement to the abolitionists of Kentucky, Missouri, Virginia, and North Carolina? Inquire of them, and ascertain.

#### RADICAL ABOLITIONIST.

NEW YORK, AUGUST, 1856.

For President,  
GERRIT SMITH, OF NEW YORK.

For Vice President,  
SAMUEL McFARLAND, OF PENNSYLVANIA.

**T**EAK NOTICE, that we do not make any charges for papers sent to those who have not ordered or subscribed for them.

**L**etters for the Editor of the Radical Abolitionist, or for the Treasurer of the American Abolition Society, should be addressed to Post office box No. 1212, No. 48 Beekman st. New York. We shall then get them without the delay and extra charge of two cents for delivery by the penny post.

**O**UR SECOND VOLUME.—With this number we commence the Second Volume of our "RADICAL ABOLITIONIST."—Subscribers will please renew their subscriptions, by sending payments in advance, as usual.—Now is the time to obtain and send names of new subscribers.

#### KANSAS AID CONVENTION AT BUFFALO.

In accordance with suggestions of valued friends, as well as our own impressions of duty, we attended the Convention of Kansas Aid Committees, delegates, &c., held July 9th and 10th at Buffalo. The signs of the times appear to threaten a sanguinary civil war. If such should prove to be fact—or whatever the event might be—we desired to obtain all the information we could, and from head quarters, concerning the incipient measures in the Free States, looking towards a military defence of Kansas. We went in company with Gerrit Smith, and put up at a hotel at which a large portion of the western delegates were assembling. By conversing with them, as well as by hearing the discussions, much important information could be gleaned, which would not reach us from any published account of the public proceedings.

On Wednesday A. M. the Convention met at Kremlin Hall, and was continued till Thursday, 5 P. M.—after which a public meeting was held in the evening. There were delegates from eleven States.

Ex-Gov. Reeder was President of the Convention. In the Business Committee, (as we learned,) Gerrit Smith presented a series of resolutions, a portion of which were considered by the Committee too radical and revolutionary to be reported to the Convention. Passing by these, they selected and reported such of them as had respect to the details of organizing a Central Committee to receive and disburse funds, &c. These were discussed and adopted in the afternoon, and a Central Committee appointed at Chicago.

Gerrit Smith, on his own responsibility, then

presented the rest of his resolutions, which are thus condensed in the New York Tribune—

"That armed men must be sent to Kansas to conquer the armed men who come against her, and that justification for sending them is to be found in the refusal of the Government to do it; and that the Government, instead of protecting Kansas, is the great instigator and upholder of the oppression and outrages which she suffers."

We observed that the most startling portions of the Resolutions elicited the warmest responses of the audience, including many of the delegates. A number of speakers, however, including Ex-Gov. Reeder, Rev. Joshua Leavitt, and Rev. Henry Cowles of Oberlin, took more moderate views, deprecating extreme measures.

We, too, had come to the Convention with a view of presenting some thoughts, which, we supposed, might differ, somewhat, from those of any other friend of free Kansas, in attendance. We had drawn up a series of twenty questions, for the consideration of the Convention. It was nearly 11 o'clock in the evening when we obtained the floor, and, on motion, the Convention adjourned, giving us the floor in the morning.

On the morning of Thursday, after we had completed our remarks, Ex-Gov. Reeder introduced a series of Resolutions, as substitutes for those of Gerrit Smith. After discussion, both were re-committed to the Committee, who, in the afternoon, reported a series, satisfactory to both the parties, and they were adopted.

The plan of operations, previously adopted, recommended that an effort be made to raise \$100,000 per month, for the Committee at Chicago. Gerrit Smith opened the subscription by putting his name down for \$1,500 per month, and Eli Thayer of Massachusetts was appointed—and accepted the appointment—to organize the friends of free Kansas in the free States, on the plan of monthly contributions. Funds are to be sent to George W. Dole, Esq., Chicago, Ill.

What the result will be, Heaven only knows. The magnitude of the undertaking, and the solemnity of the crisis, will be suggested to the reflecting mind, by a careful consideration of the following Resolutions, adopted by the Convention.

"Resolved, That the Federal Administration, instead of protecting Kansas, is a great upholder of the oppressions and outrages which she suffers.

"Resolved, That the attempt to force slavery upon Kansas must, at whatever cost, be defeated, and that too whether the Federal Government shall or shall not continue to favor the nefarious attempt.

Resolved, That the Kansas bill just passed the Senate is deceptive and fraudulent, inasmuch as it sustains the validity of the government imposed upon the people by an armed invasion, and leaves the great wrongs of Kansas unredressed—with liberty crushed out—her prominent men imprisoned, or hunted as fugitives on false and ridiculous charges—the mass of the bona fide settlers subdued, plundered, disheartened, and many of them driven out—the national thoroughfares blockaded by an armed force against all the Free State emigrants—and that the passage therefore of the bill into an act of Congress would be adding mockery to wrong, and make of Kansas a slave State."

Our own opinions, in respect to this movement, so far as we have matured them, are indicated in the *questions* we propounded to the

Convention, in connection with a brief abstract of the remarks with which we accompanied them. We present them to our readers for the same reasons which led us to submit them to the Convention. It is as important that the people of the free States should examine the subject as it was that the Convention at Buffalo should examine it.

#### COUNTING THE COST.

Questions submitted to the late Kansas Aid Convention in Buffalo, together with a brief abstract of remarks made on the same, by W.M. GOODELL, of New York.

Mr. President—It is the dictate of common prudence to deliberate before acting, especially when action is proposed which may seriously affect the tranquility, the security, and the liberties of a great nation. The Resolutions now before this Convention are of the gravest importance. If I do not greatly misconstrue their bearing—if I do not indeed mistake the alternative presented to us by *any* proposed arrangements for a further prosecution, at the present time, of an armed defence of the free State settlers in Kansas, against the now ascertained determination of the Federal Administration and its supporters to “subdue” them, and to force slavery upon that Territory, we have come up, plumply, to the point at which we cannot go a step farther, in a way of armed defence, without entering directly upon a civil war. The hazards of this, to say the least, are as a hundred to one. The one party or the other must come to a stand, or the collision is certain. If this be so, it is time to sit down and count the cost before we move forward.

To facilitate an orderly and distinct review of the whole subject, I have drawn up a series of connected questions, which I will now read to the Convention, and to which I shall add some remarks.

1. Is an armed defence of Kansas (or of *freedom* in Kansas) a feasible enterprise, so long as it is understood that the defence will *not* be made against United States' troops, nor against persons acting under authority of the Federal Executive?

To this question, as it seems to me, there can be only one answer. All the statements made in this Convention, like all the accounts that had previously reached us, go direct to the point. The border ruffians act, and claim to act, under license of the Federal Government. Col. Bufort's predatory hordes, collected in Carolina and Georgia, and breathing out threatenings and slaughter against the free settlers, no sooner reach Kansas than they begin their threatened work. But they do it as a *posse* of the Federal authorities! The flames of Lawrence are kindled by them, and no Federal reproof or disclaimer comes to our ears. The legislature of Kansas was to have assembled at Topeka on the fourth. We are hourly expecting to hear the result. If the threatened dispersion takes place, it will be by the sufferance if not by the direct action, of the Federal troops.\*

\* Four hours afterwards, the full verification of this prediction, was read by Governor Reeder to the Convention, from the New York Times.

Since the above note was penned, another corroborative fact comes to hand in the New York Times of

I know that a distinction has been made between that lawful bearing of arms which the Constitution secures to each citizen, and the enlistment of soldiers as troops to regulate the affairs of Kansas, which would be revolutionary. But I know, too, that Col. Lane commands troops, and that effective aid for free Kansas must reinforce them ten-fold, in the beginning, probably thirty-fold before long. It would be otherwise if *only* petty pillage, requiring private defence, were to be guarded against. It would be otherwise, if the invading hordes of the South were not countenanced by the Federal Administration, protected and seconded by the Federal arm. We must look at the facts as they are. And in the light of them, the boasted distinction utterly fails. If your Chicago Committee does not expend its funds against the Federal troops and bogus Territorial militia of President Pierce, it will expend them in vain. It will expend them for muskets or Sharpe's rifles to be given up to the enemy.—You must fight the Federal troops, or obey them, and lay down your arms and disband.—The constitutional right to bear arms will share the fate of all other constitutional rights, under an Admininstration that tramples upon them all. “Constitutional rights,” forsooth, from an Administration that forces upon Kansas the Missouri Slave Code, enacted by Missourians!

Not much longer will eastern men contribute their funds to purchase Sharp's rifles for the use of border ruffians. But, to no other use can they come, unless they are to defend the free settlers of Kansas against the Federal troops. And the defence must be fully adequate to their protection.

To my own mind there is nothing in connection with the affairs of Kansas more certain than this, that *no* mere arming of the free settlers, as citizens, can ensure their protection, in the present condition of things, without large detachments of regular troops to defend them, at various points, or an army that will, at once, rid the Territory of all invaders, including the Federal troops, and prevent their return. The settlers are farmers, mechanics, merchants, and artisans. They must be at leisure to pursue their peaceful avocations. They must be at home with their families, or their settlements must be abandoned. They cannot, at the same time, defend themselves from armed invaders, consisting of the Federal troops, or backed up

July 19. A correspondent of the Chicago Tribune, writing from Leavenworth City, July 10, (the very day we were speaking at Buffalo,) relates that “yesterday a delegation of citizens called on Gen. Persifer F. Smith (the newly-arrived Vicegerent of President Pierce,) to lay their grievances before him,” and ask his protection “against marauders from South Carolina, Georgia, and Alabama, who are stationed near us, at the different river towns, *armed with United States arms*, and supported by contributions furnished by Missouri.” “When asked for relief to disperse these armed military bands, as Free State men have been dispersed in the Territory, his reply is that he has no authority—that these bands are regularly enrolled as militia of the Territory, and that everything they do is *done under color of law*, and that we (Free State men) have no redress except in the future, by resort to the civil powers that be!”

Such “civil authorities” as Judge Lecompte, who gave directions for the destruction of the hotel in Lawrence!

by them, and yet attend to their farms, their shops, and their families.

I come to a second question.

2. Is such a defense feasible, so long as it is understood that it is to be so conducted as to be purely defensive, without carrying the war into Missouri, and, (if need be,) into the other invading States?

When Napoleon was proclaimed Emperor of the French, in 1804, the crowned heads of Europe were leagued against France, and—as I well remember—the general belief of statesmen and generals was, that France must speedily be swallowed up, and partitioned among them. How was that consummation prevented? By one thing, and by one only. Instead of standing on the defensive, Napoleon astonished the world and revived the vitality of France, by suddenly carrying the war to the capitals of his enemies. I am no military man, though I have read military history. I will not dogmatize. But I should like to ask any military statesman, as I now ask this Convention, by what methods, by what expenditures, is freedom to be defended in Kansas, without turning back the tide of invasion upon her invaders? And this brings me to another question.

3. Is such defense or such war feasible, so long as it is understood to be confined to the *whites*, and under an implied pledge *not* to extend it to the defense and liberation of the enslaved, and by inviting their co-operation and aid?

Who ever heard of a sagacious general who ignored, as non-existent, or who repelled, as alien to his projects, the great body of the population most deeply interested in his success? a population residing in the very heart of the invading country, and holding the power of paralyzing its forces by simply raising their hands?

If this question should shock the sensibilities of any one in this Convention, I will follow it up, by asking another.

4. Would such defense be justifiable, in the sight of God, the impartial father of all men, in the sight of the civilized world, and of posterity, unless it be for the *liberation of the oppressed*, as well as for the security of the *free*?

What moral right have we, in defending, by force of arms, the liberties of our *white* brothers, to decline seeking the aid of our *colored* brothers, lest they, too, should become partakers of the sweets of freedom?

By the side of this question, I will place a kindred one.

5. If—(as is doubtless the fact)—our present troubles concerning Kansas should be regarded as a just retribution of Heaven for our great national sin of permitting and thus sustaining oppression—can it be credible that our *armed resistance* against that retribution will avert it, while we refuse to abandon the sin?

“Our prayers to Heaven will be impious”—(said John Jay, in 1780)—“unless we come into this measure”—the measure of liberating the oppressed. Would it not be equally impious in us to pray for the success of our own arms against despotic aggression, so long as we refuse to invite our colored brethren to the mutual benefits of mutual protection against the same despotism?

Our fathers *thought* they had secured the

liberties of themselves and their posterity, without liberating the enslaved. We, their children, this day, cannot help perceiving their mistake. If we, too, should *appear* to have secured freedom for Kansas and repose for our country, without liberating the enslaved, would not our children find out *our* mistake? In other words,

6. From all that we know of human nature and of the operation of moral and political causes and effects—under an overruling Providence—have we any reason to expect that any military defense of freedom in Kansas that should leave slavery in the States undisturbed, could afford us any thing more than a mere seeming and temporary relief, resulting in a renewed and permanent reign of despotism in the end?

I confess my own strong conviction that all such expectations would be delusive. In the act of cherishing such expectations I should be compelled to expect that the nature of man will be changed—that the connection between moral causes and effects will be severed—that the moral and Providential Government of God over the nations will be overthrown.

As well might I anticipate success on grounds involving the repeal of the laws that govern the material world. As soon could I expect the planets to diverge from their orbits, and the law of gravitation to be annullled. Nay, more. All such changes, if the Creator pleased, might take place. But, without contradicting himself, he could not allow us to succeed in removing the pillars of his own throne.

Universal history may assure us that such a thing cannot be.

Mr. President: My inquiries, thus far, have been in a direction adapted to exhibit the magnitude and the solemnity of the enterprise proposed to us, in an armed defence of liberty in Kansas.

My remaining questions will amplify the inquiry whether we are prepared for such an enterprize? I shall take for granted (what I think has been now made apparent) that no enterprize less comprehensive can avail us, at the present crisis.

My question, then, is this—

7. If an examination of the preceding questions shall result in the conviction that *no military operations in Kansas*, of a limited and circumscribed character, could be of any permanent benefit to the cause of freedom—the question comes home to us whether we are prepared, and whether the friends of liberty in Kansas are prepared, *to go farther*?

Has the time come, and is it the dictate of sound discretion and true wisdom, to inaugurate, at the present juncture, a system of operations which, to be even temporarily successful, must involve us in a direct conflict, by force of arms, with the constituted Federal authorities—which would compel us to carry the war into Missouri and the other slave States, which would require us to arm the slaves, and pledge us to the defence of *their* liberties, as well as to the defence of *our own*? More particularly—

8. To whom, and to what quarter shall we look for an adequate and permanent supply of the men, the arms, the provisions and the revenues for carrying on such an enterprize? Is

there a single State Government which would come into the measure? Have we any assurances of this? Or can we depend upon individual contributions from the people, or from portions of them, sufficient to meet any sober estimate of the expenditures?

How large a force will probably be needed? And for how long a time? And what will be the expense? You have voted to raise one hundred thousand dollars per month. But what proportion would this sum bear to the demands that will be made upon your disbursing committee? And where, and from whence is even this sum to be raised?

I shall not attempt to answer these questions, but they ought to be considered and answered here, before the Convention separates. They ought to have been considered and answered, before your course of operations was decided upon. By organizing your Committee in the first place, and leaving the Resolutions to be discussed afterwards, you began your business at the wrong end. Some of the western delegates, on completing the organization, last evening, went home. They ought to be here, to-day, to tell us *what the money is to be expended for—how much is wanted—and where and how is it to be raised?* And there are other questions that should be considered and answered. Such as,

9. Is it credible that the people of the free States, (to whom we must look for the men and the money for a military defence of Kansas,) would be *more* ready and *more* unanimous for such an outlay of blood and treasure, than they would be for such a deposite of their *votes* as they be lievewould secure the same end, *without* bloodshed and *without* treasure?

10. If the friends of freedom are numerous enough to carry the next Presidential election, why should they previously resort to arms?

But, if they are not strong enough at the ballot-box, how shall they be strong enough with the cartridge-box?

The last two questions, it will be perceived, are adapted to institute a comparison between the claims of political action, and armed resistance, on behalf of Kansas—an armed resistance that, to be effective, must (as has been seen) be waged against the existing Federal Administration, carried into the slave States, and proffer liberty to the enslaved. *Which method shall be preferred?* If we cannot succeed by voting, how are we to succeed by arms? I anticipate, here, an objection, which I will meet with another question.

11. If it be said that the present exigencies of Kansas cannot *wait* for the Presidential election, the question arises whether military relief would be likely to come sooner?—and also the further question whether it be wise and safe to *shift the issue* from the arena of politics to the arena of arms?

The Presidential Election is to be acted upon, by the people, early in November. The new President, whoever he may be, takes his seat the fourth of March next. How much sooner, or more assuredly, can you collect your funds, disburse them, and bring into the field an adequate military force?

If we had two or three years longer to wait, under the heel of the reigning despotism, before

we could get redress at the ballot box, it would be a very different question. But if the free States desire relief, and if they will wisely wield the elective franchise, they can have relief early in March. It is now July. Is it wise, is it necessary, is it right, under such circumstances, to plunge the country into a civil war? Is the last remedy, the right of revolution by force, to be resorted to at such a time? Should you not wait, at least, till the early part of November, when the result of the election will probably be known?

Do you say that both the methods of redress must be simultaneously urged? This raises another question, namely,

12. Can the two issues be simultaneously and advantageously urged? Can we stand *outside* of the Constitution in the one effort, and *inside* of the Constitution in the other? If the change of issue be sought as an escape from the meshes of political intrigue, will not a military dictatorship present still greater hazards? And would not a simultaneous military and political campaign subject us to both these evils combined? Might not the ballot be controlled by the Federal bayonet, in the free States as well as in Kansas?

I do not clearly see how we could conveniently and consistently wage war with the Administration by political and military action, at one and the same time. I cannot agree with those who think to disinthral the people from the control of selfish and unscrupulous leaders, by transferring them from the dictators of the caucus to the dictators of the camp—from the drill of party, to the discipline of martial law! Could the two operations go on, together, we should have both the despotisms and both the corruptions combined, as they have been, twice, in France. Alas! for the elections that are conducted amid the din of arms, and the desolations of civil war! “I would not interfere, in the slightest degree, with the freedom of elections,” (said a French commander,) “but every soldier who does not vote for General Buonaparte, shall be shot!”

Is it objected that, under the Constitution, we cannot overthrow slavery by our votes, and that we must therefore do it by our arms? Then I ask, further—

13. Will not those whose constitutional scruples restrain them from abolishing slavery, (and thus relieving Kansas) by their *votes*, find still more weighty constitutional objections to the task of taking up arms against a regularly constituted Federal Administration, on the same issue, or on a less comprehensive one?

If it be unconstitutional to *vote* for the liberation of the whole country, can it be constitutional to *fight* for the liberation of the whole country, or of a fraction of it?

And again,

14. Is there not reason to believe that a large majority of the people of the free States, who are now inclining to the side of freedom, and preparing to vote in its favor, will be thrown back and repulsed, when they find the issue transferred from the arena of peaceful politics to that of military combat, involving the horrors of civil war, of insurrection against the Federal Government, and of a general rising of the slaves?

15. Would not the slave oligarchy, and their minions, at the seat of Government and throughout the country, be eager to avail themselves of such a change of policy on our part, and of such a reaction against us? Would they not successfully renew their charges of treason? Should we not find the ranks of freedom suddenly reduced to a mere handful? And would not the threat "WE WILL SUBDU YOU" be easily and speedily fulfilled?

On this ground I need not enlarge. The true answer to this question has been indicated already by the sensitiveness of many in this Convention, lest the country should be alarmed at the seemingly revolutionary tone of the Resolutions now before you. In the early part of my remarks I told you that the North would give little more money for Sharpe's rifles to be surrendered or virtually spiked by the orders of President Pierce. I now ask you how much money will be raised when it is seen—as it soon must be—that the money, unless thus expended, must either remain with your Committee at Chicago, or be expended in a direct conflict with the troops of President Pierce? Are the people prepared to give the money you will want, for *that* purpose?

Deplore it as you may, Gentlemen, these two alternatives seem to be before you. To fall *short* of Revolution, is to arm your free State men to no purpose. To *attempt* Revolution is, in all probability, to array the country, and perhaps even the North, against you. Our national reverence for official station, and for what is called by the name of "law," however perverted and lawless, is a stubborn fact, to be calculated upon, in counting the cost. And let it not be forgotten that no indistinctness of vision on our part, and no generalities of utterance, in setting forth our objects, can do away or conceal the alternatives already mentioned. They exist, of necessity, in the nature of the case, and will soon be perceived by others, though we should overlook or ignore them. The friends of free Kansas must soon see that less than Revolution would be a failure, and that the attempt at Revolution would be fearfully hazardous. Between these, they must decide. But the decision is not yet made by them, and we must not assume that it has been. If, for themselves, this Convention has come, or shall come to a decision, let that decision, in all its breadth and comprehension, be distinctly announced. For "if the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself for the battle?"

I may not dismiss the topic of political action without a word of explanation, lest I should be misunderstood. In preferring political to military action, I did not mean to express my own confidence in *such* political action as the majority of this Convention support. I expect relief in *no political* action—nor military action—that does not look to the liberation of Kansas, by the direct extinction of slavery itself.—But this is not inconsistent with my raising the inquiry whether political action is not better than military action, and whether the latter will not cripple the former. Nor is it inconsistent with a strong impression that an inadequate political enterprise would prove less permanently disastrous than an inadequate and abortive revolutionary one.

All my previous questions, with the results of them, I will therefore comprise in this one—

16. On a careful review of the whole subject, would it not be more safe to make a fair trial of the *ballot*-box, before resorting to the *cartridge*-box?

Just here, the example of our Revolutionary fathers will be pressed upon our attention. Not unfrequently, and from different quarters, we are goaded on, with the suggestion that if our fathers had stopped to vote, instead of meeting the enemy at Lexington and Concord, our American Revolution would have been a failure.

It has been said—and I freely admit it—that the grievances of our fathers were lighter than a feather, in the comparison with those of our brethren in Kansas. I add that they were still lighter in comparison with those of our sable brethren in bondage whom we are bound to love and protect as we love and protect ourselves.—Nay, back of all the outrages consequent on the passage of the Kansas Nebraska bill, and before it was attempted, I contend that the grievances of all our white northern citizens whose religion requires the shewing of mercy to the poor, were infinitely greater than those of our fathers, who complained of a three-penny tax upon tea! For the exercise of that religion they were, and still are subjected to fines and imprisonments—a persecution more vitally aimed at Christ's religion than that which sent the May-flower to Plymouth.

But possibly all this may not prove that we must needs meet the enemy, as did our fathers, with cold steel, instead of votes. I propound, therefore, a farther question.

17. Does the example of our Revolutionary fathers, who enjoyed no *representation* in the Parent government justify *us* in a resort to *arms*, while we hold a majority of votes in our hands?

The burden of complaint with our fathers, was, that they were taxed without any representation in Parliament. Had the Mother Country allowed them that representation, their complaint would have been silenced, notwithstanding their then meagre population could have given them no preponderating influence in Parliament. Their only relief would have been the gratification of casting, in that body, a lean minority vote, with such possible accessions as their eloquence and the justice of their cause might ultimately command.

Not so with the people of the Free States. They not only enjoy representation, but, (notwithstanding the unequal apportionment to which they needlessly consent) they actually hold and cast a controlling majority of the votes for President and Vice-President, and both Houses of Congress. Whenever the people of the North really desire relief, they can have it by casting their votes. They have no need to purchase fire-arms or to support armies. They have only to drop suitable bits of paper into little boxes, and the work is done! Why then should they resort to arms?

Another point of difference between our condition and that of our Revolutionary fathers deserves attention.

18. Should *their* success against a *foreign* foe—(not without *foreign aid*)—under sanction of their Colonial Governments, and by direction

of a Continental Congress, encourage us, *without* foreign aid, to encounter a *domestic* foe, wielding our national arms and national resources against us, while we are without the sanction of the State Governments, and without the direction of any central Executive or Congress?

Our fathers did not take up arms in mere voluntary associations, and under the supervision of committees of citizens. They had colonial Governments, to begin with, and they added a Continental Congress, and secured foreign aid. We are without all these; and besides, our enemy is here in the midst of us, in the form of a regularly installed administration of our own national Government. Our resources are not in our own hands, but in the hands of the enemy. The example of our Revolutionary fathers cannot guide our policy here—nor can their success afford encouragement for us.

From a prudential question we will now turn to a moral one.

19. As we have so long consented to leave the millions of our *enslaved* countrymen under the heel of the Slave Power, and of our National Government, without attempting to liberate them, either by our *votes* or our *arms*, does it become us to be so impatient for the redress of our own recent and less unendurable wrongs, as to resort to revolutionary *carnage* before trying the efficacy of our *votes*?

Mr. President! I trust I do not fall behind any member of this Convention in the depth of my sympathy for our outraged brethren in Kansas, nor in any just abhorrence of their oppressors, and indignation at their wrongs. And I have the same stake that others have, in the freedom and prosperity of the great growing West, where my children reside. But I must not allow myself to forget the millions of my colored countrymen, who for centuries have been writhing under the same iron heel that now tramples upon Kansas, and threatens to "subdue" the entire North. I cannot forget that—in all human probabilities and sober estimates—not one month of the past eighty years has passed by, that has not carried with it the record of far greater outrages and deeper wrongs upon the Southern slaves than have yet fallen to the lot of the free settlers in Kansas. And I should blush to detect myself bristling up with surmounted bayonet to redress the wrongs of *white* men, after having so long and so patiently endured the sight of far greater wrongs inflicted upon *colored* men.

In the stillness of my own heart I should expect to hear the voice of upbraiding at the narrowness of my humanity and the partiality of my justice.

I propound only one question more:

20. Does the general history of bloody revolutions—including even that of our fathers—(which left us under an oligarchy of slaveholders)—afford us any refutation of the maxim of O'Connell that "any revolution costs too much that costs a sanguinary civil war"?

If I rightly read the records of the world we live in, of the race to which we belong, the cause of human liberty, in the wide scope of the nations and the ages, has lost vastly more by attempted bloody revolutions, than it has gained by them. I am aware that many learned students of history will dissent from me in this. But I am also aware of the fallacies by which

most readers of history are misled. History itself, as it is written, and, as it is unwritten, or mis-written, almost necessarily misleads. Successful treason becomes glorious revolution, fires the historian, and emblazons his page. Men read, and admire, and attempt to imitate. Attempted revolution, if suppressed, is treason. The record survives a century or two, and is forgotten. Fifty forgotten failures are eclipsed by one immortalized success. The exception is mistaken for the rule, and is made the guide. The consequence is, that revolutionary adventure, like lottery adventure, becomes a perpetuated passion, though, on the whole, and in the long run, it be a ruinous game. The passion for gaming and the passion for violent revolution, by the bye, are related to each other, they often go hand in hand, and their effects are, in character, the same. They deceive, they intoxicate, they destroy. Whoever shall succeed in writing a truthful World's History of the methods by which a World's Despotisms have become consolidated, and a World's Liberties perpetually throttled, will find the secret to lie, mainly, in a never-ending series of partial, selfish, fragmentary, narrow, half-conceived, and easily crushed insurrections, *commenced without counting the cost*. There is nothing that ministers so largely to the strength of a despotism, as the prestige of overcoming a revolt.

I have spoken of civil war. That there is civil war in Kansas, it is impossible to conceal. That the business before this Convention involves the question of its continued prosecution, in defense of freedom, it were in vain to deny. I have intimated that its continued prosecution must extend it beyond Kansas, must carry it into the heart of the South. I should have added that, in my judgment, it may rage likewise in the North, and the more assuredly, if the South should be much longer unassailed. The controversy is not intrinsically, nor exclusively, a sectional one. The victims of the slave power, its natural enemies, are principally at the South. Its allies are strong in the North. The despotic Federal administration finds the sinews of its strength here—its army of serviles—its revenues—its fortresses, its arsenals, its subsidized presses are here, in our very midst. The bloody altars and the deluded devotees of its inhuman religion are also here. How then can the North escape? You propose to collect your funds at the North and East. Your recruits must come from the North, East, or West. Over this entire region the enemy still reigns, and reigns in the sacred but abused name and robes of "order and law." Will his power be dormant or inoperative here? May not the hostile elements explode, and come in conflict, here, without waiting to reach their destination in Kansas, or farther south? You are expecting a severe struggle, here, in the North, at the polls. Transfer that issue from the ballot to the sword, and, think you that there will be no fighting here? In this city, wherein we assemble, would all be found on one side? In New York city, the place of my residence, on which side do you think the majority would be found? And what would be the condition of freemen, here, at the North, under a Presidential proclamation of outlawry, as in Kansas, and under the reign of martial law?

Mr. President, and Gentlemen of the Convention, these are inquiries which you should carefully ponder, before you fix upon the course to be pursued. It is a great and solemn question that is to be settled here, to-day—a question that should be probed to the bottom, and examined on every side. I do not ask you to take counsel of unworthy fears. But I do implore you to reject the guidance of impulse and passion, and hot haste. Especially do I call upon you to *count the cost*—to be guided by great principles, not by shallow expedients—to act for all coming time, not for the brief present—to act for the whole country and for all its inhabitants, not for a single territory, or for a color or race. I ask you to abstain from a hazardous attempt at revolution, until or unless there is no other hope for freedom—no other alternative left. Even then, I ask you to consider whether freedom or fetters, for posterity, is to be the purchase of your blood—whether civil war be indeed the heaven-appointed security of civil freedom? If it be indeed so, and if, with clean consciences and pure hearts you can invoke the God of battles, knowing that he looks complacently upon your enterprise, then let the comprehensiveness of your aims, and the self-sacrificing magnificence of your measures, bear witness that you are contending for humanity, and not for a caste—that you are fighting under the banners of the God of the oppressed, and with his commission to "proclaim liberty throughout all the land, unto all the inhabitants thereof."

[NOTE.—It was our intention to give but an abstract of our speech at Buffalo, but have been led to vary some portions of it—though retaining the sentiment—and have somewhat amplified it, at the close.]

#### AID FOR THE SUFFERERS IN KANSAS!

This is a distinct thing from the raising of funds for prosecuting the military defence of the free State men in Kansas, and a distinct movement has been made for the object. The Ladies of Illinois have organized a State Society with auxiliaries, for the purpose. It is in contemplation to form similar Societies in other States. We became acquainted, at Buffalo, with some of the ladies engaged in this enterprise. One of them, Mrs. CUTLER, of Illinois, is about visiting the more easterly States to collect funds and promote the work of organization to that end. Whatever doubts may arise in respect to the military movement, there can be but one sentiment in respect to *this*. Food and clothing are wanted for those who have been ferociously plundered. We heartily commend this charity to the attention of our readers.

THE REPUBLICAN PLATFORM—TRUE VERSION.—As we supposed—the N. Y. Tribune's version of the Republican Platform was a misprint. We have received a corrected copy from Hon. David Wilmot, who reported it to the Convention. It reads—

"That, as our Republican fathers, when they had abolished slavery in all our National Territory, ordained that 'no person should be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law,' it becomes our duty to maintain this provision of the Constitution against all attempts to violate it, to prevent the establishment of slavery in [the territories of] the United States, by positive legislation prohibiting its existence therein."

In the Tribune's copy, the words in brackets were omitted, thus making the sentence express the "Radical" doctrine, which would not be in harmony with other parts of the document.

**✉** The Radical Abolitionists of Illinois met in Mass Convention, July 31, at Joliet, to nominate Presidential Electors to vote for GERRIT SMITH and SAMUEL McFARLAND. The notice reached us too late for insertion in our last number.

**✉** CORRECTION.—In an article in our last paper headed "the Constitutional Argument," for Judge Emmett read Emott.

**✉** The RADICAL ABOLITIONISTS of the State of New York will meet to designate Presidential Electors to support the nomination of GERRIT SMITH and SAMUEL McFARLAND, at the time and place of the holding of the State Liberty Party Convention, of which notice will be given, soon.

**✉** The plan of publishing semi-monthly is relinquished, for the present. Those who sent contributions for that object can have them returned, if they so direct. Otherwise, the amounts will be considered as donations to the American Abolition Society.

#### CIRCULAR OF THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE.

##### To the Abolitionists of the United States:

The National Abolition Convention, assembled at Syracuse, N. Y., May 28th and 29th, 1856, having nominated Gerrit Smith of N. York for President, and Samuel McFarland, of Pennsylvania for Vice-President of the United States, appointed the undersigned a National Committee, to promote the objects of said Convention.

It is earnestly recommended, by the National Convention, that State Conventions of abolitionists in favor of said nominations, be held as soon as possible, in each state, to select presidential electors for the several districts, and to take efficient measures for printing and distributing tickets, and otherwise laboring to secure their election. The time and place of holding said Conventions in each state, will be designated and notified by the member of this committee residing in the state. In states wherein no member of this Committee resides, the friends of the cause will please consult and notify a State Convention. Every thing, almost, depends upon the local activity and vigilance of the friends of the cause, in the different states, counties, towns, cities and villages.

WILLIAM GOODELL, of New York,  
*Chairman of the Committee.*

THOMAS CUSHING, Maine.

DANIEL FOSTER, Massachusetts.

JOHN R. FOREST, Vermont.

A. G. BEMAN, Connecticut.

A. B. BURDICK, Rhode Island.

ARTHUR TAPPAN, New Jersey.

GEORGE F. HORTON, Pennsylvania.

A. PRYNE, Ohio.

C. C. FOOTE, Michigan.

H. O. WAGONER, Illinois.

L. P. FROST, Wisconsin.

S. M. BELL, Virginia.

**✉** Letters, and remittances for the National Committee, (including subscriptions made at the National Nominating Convention at Syracuse) should be directed to the chairman of the Committee, William Goodell, Box 1212, No. 48 Beekman Street, New York. All the funds furnished will be promptly and faithfully expended to carry on the campaign vigorously, by circulating publications, and otherwise.